

The Janesville Daily Gazette.

VOLUME 24

Entered at the Post Office at Janesville, Wis., as second-class matter.

JANESVILLE, WISCONSIN, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1880.

Published Every Evening Except Sunday at \$7 a Year.

NUMBER 196

A photograph of a confident and happy Democrat would sell well in this campaign.

A Republican can't turn around in this canvass and quote history, without stepping on the toe of a Democrat.

A communique: Was the mule that kicked Wade Hampton the same one that kicked over the Democratic party in Indiana?

None of the "mugger" societies have called on Hancock. They propose to treat that gentleman with silent contempt.

The only thing the Democrats have to do this campaign is to whistle to keep their courage up, and that is no house business.

It is pretty hard on the Democrats to go into the fight on the 2d of November, when they know they are going to get whipped.

If General Hancock can find another good quill he will be able to write a few more explanatory letters before the election of Garfield.

The principles of the Republican party are running in the canvass and that is why the Democrats are slaking in their boots. That hurts them.

Just before the campaign closes, the Republicans should have another speech from Hampton, and at least another explanatory letter from Hancock.

A petrified woman has been found in Nevada. The body originally, belonged to a shriveled, sickly woman, but the petrification weighed 200 pounds.

Ben. Hill says the Democratic idiot who started the "329" ought to be given a tin horn and sent into solitude, as it lost the party two Congressmen in Ohio.

You will not mention to the Democrats a kind service, the 329 and the tariff. The party is in its death struggle and it doesn't want to be twitted of its past sins.

When President Hayes was in Washington Territory, he visited a saw mill, and the report says, "with his own hands sawed a log, ninety-eight feet long, like an old mill hand."

Because the Republican party want peace, prosperity, honest voting and honest counting, civilization and progress wherever the flag waves, the Democratic party calls that sectionalism.

To a man up a tree, the Democrats are having a hard time. They can find no Republican who will take any stock in their promises, and without Republican votes they can't elect Hancock.

How can a party expect to win, when it has never done anything it promised to do, since 1862. That is a long time—twenty eight years—but during these years the Democratic party has been a faithless party.

The biggest and the most costly locomotive in the United States is the "William H. Vanderbilt," just built for the New York Central road. It will run forty miles an hour with twenty loaded coaches.

The Democrats have ceased firing their mud-machines at the Republican candidates, and have turned them on the members of their own party. That puts humor as well as victory in the campaign for the Republicans.

Chairman Parkinson is rather bidding for Barnum's place on the Democratic National committee. We wish he would get it. We like to see consummate skill rewarded; and beside that, the election of Garfield would be unanimous.

Why don't some veteran Union soldiers, some workmen's organizations, or some business men's association, call on Hancock? Scores of them are visiting the candidate at Mentor every day, but alas! Governor's Island is forgotten.

When Secretary Sherman charged Wade Hampton with being connected with the k-k-klux, he stepped on a tender corn, and as the ex-rebel general can't disprove the charge, he wants to shoot. The pistol is the only argument a Southerner can offer when he gets mad.

It was awful mean, the Democrats say, to spring the tariff question on them in this campaign. The meanness comes in, when the Democratic convention denounced the tariff an iniquitous, harmful abomination. That's where the people disagree with the Democratic party.

The Republicans of Wisconsin are doing noble work in this campaign. Over fifty political meetings will be held in the State to-day. While the Wisconsin division of the Republican army is marching grandly to victory, the squad of Democratic stragglers is lost in the rear.

For the special benefit of the Democrats who should be deeply interested in the record of their party, we offer some free information. When the bill came up in Congress in 1870, to refund the national debt, every Democratic Senator voted against it, and only one Democrat in all the House voted for it.

Miss Helen M. Macdonald, of Boston, invented a strip of waterproof material designed to be sewed to the bottom of a lady's dress to protect it from the dust and moisture. A man sued her for an infringement, and Miss Macdonald conducted the case herself, and examined

the witnesses, argued the case before the jury, and won the suit.

ADVICE TO A YOUNG VOTER.

EVANSVILLE, Oct. 23.—Mr. Editor: I am to cast my first vote on the 2d of November, and my father is to vote for General Garfield, but my father, who has been a Democrat all his life, says to me to vote for General Hancock. He says that the success of the Democratic party is best for the country, and also because the Democrats more nearly represent the spirit and progress of the times. Now, I appeal to you. Does the history of the party prove my father's reasoning?

A YOUNG VOTER.

Let us tell you what to do with the old gentleman. Tell him you want to know why the Democratic party "more nearly represents the spirit and progress of the times," than the Republican party. Tell him you want to vote for the candidate of the party which has done the most service for the country, which is the most honest, and which gives the greater assurance that it will remain honest. If your father is a Democrat of the old school, and as the saying is "died in the wool," he will tell you to vote for Hancock. But tell him you are after solid information, because you want to start off right when you cast your first vote.

Ask him to give you a little history of the Democratic party for the last twenty years. At this he may probably scratch his head, and appear embarrassed, but be patient with, and give him time to recover from the embarrassment of his position. Be calm, don't crowd him to the wall too severely at first, but kindly insist on receiving from him the information you want. If he refuses to give you a brief history of the party and doesn't want to be bothered, you might ask him some leading questions, and gently press him for answers. Among the questions which are very important at this time, we suggest a few which are simple in themselves, but exceedingly weighty in the present canvass. Begin away back, twenty years ago, and come gradually up to the present time, as follows:

Why did the Democratic party oppose the homestead law which gave young men a chance to enter 160 acres of public land, and make a home for themselves and become independent farmers?

When the Republican Congress passed the bill why did Buchanan veto the bill, and why did the Democratic party favor the veto?

Why did the Democratic party, as a party, favor secession in 1861, and vote in Congress against sustaining the administration in putting down the rebellion?

Why did the Democratic party favor slavery, enlist all its sympathies with the slave States, and denounce the emancipation proclamation?

Why did every leading Democratic paper in the United States, and every prominent Democrat in Congress and out of it, cheer over the resolution that the war was a failure?

Why did the Democratic party, almost solidly, oppose the constitutional amendments giving the freedmen the right to be protected in their rights, and the right to vote?

Why did the Democratic party in Congress, supported by the party out of it, vote to elect every man who bought a government bond with which to help whip the traitors who were in armed rebellion?

Can you name the time and circumstance when the Democratic party in the last twenty years, did a single honest act in keeping with the spirit of liberty, justice, and progress?

At this question the old gentleman may get excited and appear mad, but keep cool yourself, wait a moment for an answer, and when he fails to answer the question you can proceed.

Why did the Democratic party in Congress unanimously oppose resumption in 1874, when to resume was the only way to settle values, to stop the gambling in gold, and to revive the drooping commerce and industries of the country?

Why does the Democratic party fuse with the Greenbackers and inflationists at every opportunity?

Why did it vote in Congress to pension rebel soldiers?

Why has it always been on the side of slavery and human oppression?

Why did it endorse the scheme of Tilden to buy or steal the Presidency?

Why has it always opposed a tariff to build up our industries and to make our workmen prosperous?

Why is it that all the slave States and all the States lately in rebellion, are always Democratic?

Why is it that there are no working-men's clubs for Hancock?

Why is it that in States which are largely Democratic, you find a greater degree of illiteracy than in any other?

Why is it that the great North, the seat of wealth, civilization, patriotism, learning, and industry, is solid for the Republican party?

Why was it that when the news came from Maine that the Democratic-Greenback party had won, government securities and all kinds of stock, went down, and there was a trembling throughout the business circles of the country; but when the news came that the Democrats had been defeated in Indiana, securities advanced 2½ per cent. at once, stocks rose rapidly, and the business men of the country gave three cheers for Indiana?

It is not likely your father will answer one of these questions, and for the information you want you will have to go to the political history of the country. It will not be strange if the old gentleman fails to prove his position, for there is not a Democratic editor or orator in all the land who can give a satisfactory answer to a single one of these questions.

THE CAMPAIGN.

The Democrats Utilizing all The Brains They Have Got.

The Management of Their Campaign Given to S. J. Tilden.

In the Hope that He will Cipher Them Out of Trouble.

The Republicans Confident of Carrying Connecticut by a Good Majority.

Gossip Relating to the Wisconsin Chief Justiceship.

Judge Cole for Chief Justice and Hon. J. B. Cassoday for Associate.

Shocking Murder by an Insane Man at River Falls.

More Sad Details of the Alpena Disaster.

The Funeral Ceremonies of the Late Chief Justice Ryan in Milwaukee.

Other Interesting State and Miscellaneous News Items.

TILDEN.

The Democrats at Last Utilizing All The Brains They Have Got.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Oct. 23.—The Evening Star of today prints the following: "A prominent Democrat said today: 'I know whereof I speak. I know that Tilden is now managing the Democratic campaign. In taking the helm he made two commands—first, that he be commander-in-chief, and the National Committee should follow his instructions; and second, that Tammany and the Irving Hall Democracy should settle their differences and agree upon a candidate for Mayor of New York City, upon whom both factions would unite.'"

CONNECTICUT.

The Republicans Confident of a Fair Majority.

HARTFORD, Conn., Oct. 22.—Conversation with leading Republicans to-day indicated general confidence in the ability of the Republicans to carry the State for Garfield by a fair majority. Comparatively little importance appears to be attached to Democratic claims that the Greenback vote, having largely returned to the Democratic ranks, will give them a much stronger vote than their opponents dream of. Careful Republicans attach some importance to this assertion, and are content with predicting a majority of 1,000, instead of from 3,000 to 5,000, as claimed by their more enthusiastic brethren. I am inclined to side with the cautious faction, for experience has shown that predicting Connecticut majorities is a hazardous work. Much interest attaches to the carrying of the Legislature, in which the Republicans had last winter a majority of ninety on joint ballot out of a total of 240. The Republicans are especially desirous of holding this majority, to the end that a Republican may be elected to the United States Senate in place of Senator Eaton, now the only New England senator who is a Democrat. Those who know the wily tactics of Mr. Barnum, of the Democratic National Committee, apprehend that the Republicans will carry the State for Garfield. He will abandon the general result, and concentrate his efforts upon securing Democratic majority in the Legislature. He has been in the Senate once, and such a plume rescued from a general Republican victory would give him the right to another election. But Mr. Barnum will have trouble in carrying out his programme, for the Republicans in the Senate, during the early part of the month, carried ninety-three votes, against fifty-seven by the Democrats. This indicates a safe majority for them in the Legislature.

FOR CHIEF JUSTICE.

Speculations Relating to the Office of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

MADISON, Oct. 22.—The death of Chief Justice Ryan places upon Governor Smith the responsibility of appointing his successor. Judge Ryan's term of service would have expired one year from the 1st of January next, and his successor would have been chosen at this spring election. Now the Governor will appoint some one to fill out the unexpired term, and already there is considerable discussion in legal circles throughout the State in reference to filling the high position. Many leading lawyers are of the opinion that Governor Smith will tender the appointment to the Hon. Orasmus Cole, one of the associate justices of the supreme court, who has already been upon the bench for 25 years. He is a gentleman of conceded ability, of great and extensive legal learning, of high personal character, and his promotion to the office of chief justice would be well received and approved by the bar of the State. Some of the friends of ex-Senator T. O. Howe will undoubtedly press his great claims and fitness upon Governor Smith; but he has been so long out of the practice of the law that it is doubtful if his appointment would meet with as ready a response as the appointment of Judge Cole.

It is said that Judge Cole is quite indifferent to the action which the Governor may take in the matter, as the salary of the Asso-

ciate Justice is the same as that of the chief justice; but, as he is the senior member of the court, it would not be treating him well to appoint a new man over his head.

In case Judge Cole is appointed chief justice, there will be a vacancy in the office of associate justice, to be filled by appointment also, and it is understood the Hon. J. B. Cassoday, of Janesville, will be a candidate for that appointment.

SAD VIGILS.

No More Bodies Found Additional Names to the List of Victims.

GRAND HAVEN, Oct. 24.—Although two tugs have been out all day, and many men seeking the bodies of friends have patrolled the beach between here and Holland, only one body, that of an unknown man, evidently a deck hand, has been found. The lake was calm this forenoon, with light westerly winds in the afternoon. It is now (8 p.m.) raining. Although tugs will go out again to-morrow, and the beach continue to be patrolled, there is but little hope of finding any bodies. It is doubtful if the greater number of them will ever be found. The general opinion is that if the Alpena went down in mid lake the water is probably so deep that the bodies will never come to the surface.

A Blanchard, of Huntley, Ill.; Frank Pope, of St. James, Michigan; E. A. Anderson, of Lansing, Michigan; Mrs. Sarah J. Brown, of Chicago; and Mr. J. H. Luck, of Philadelphia; John B. Patterson, of Chicago, and H. L. 1st. Chas. of Lawdale, Illinois, have been added to the list of passengers to-day.

CHIEF JUSTICE RYAN.

Funeral Ceremonies at Milwaukee Yesterday.

MILWAUKEE, Oct. 22.—The remains of Chief Justice Edward G. Ryan were interred in Forest Home cemetery this afternoon. The funeral services were conducted by the Rev. W. H. Throop, rector of St. James' church. The corpse was viewed by hundreds of persons at the church prior to the funeral. A special detail of eight policemen bore the coffin, which was tastefully draped in black velvet and broadcloth and covered with beautiful and emblematic floral designs, including a massive cross of immortelles. Many distinguished citizens witnessed the ceremonies.

DOBSON'S DEAL.

How a Wall Street Bucketeer Made \$3,000,000.

NEW YORK, Oct. 23.—A strange story comes to light to-night. Mrs. James W. Hogan, wife of the well-to-do jeweler of this city, and daughter of C. Yates, a millionaire of Fifth avenue, became acquainted with a Wall Street curbstone broker named L. C. Dobson, through the medium of a flirtation at a theatre within the past month. The husband was called away from home frequently and had no reason to suspect his wife's infidelity, but the facts finally came to his knowledge, and a fearful scene ensued. The wife left her home and three children, and has since resided at the Irving house on Broadway, with Dobson. Last week the father of this woman died, and he bequeathed her a large portion of his property, amounting to nearly \$3,000,000.

SHOCKING TRAGEDY.

ST. PAUL, Oct. 22.—On the afternoon of September 24, at River Falls, Wisconsin, Mary Walton, aged 16 years, was found in her home horribly murdered. A younger sister was found on a lounge unconscious, but she afterwards recovered. Luke Walton, the father, was at once suspected. He was missing. Some persons advanced the opinion that he had committed suicide, but the officers kept up the hunt. Yesterday they were rewarded by finding him in El Paso, Wis. The mortifier is now at Ellsworth, his old home. He says he killed his daughter to prevent her starving to death, and had dragged the younger in the closet. He then hid in Goodwin's hotel barn in River Falls for a week, and afterwards in straw piles, and in the woods near town, coming into the village at night to procure provisions. Sheriff Nelson says that Walton is insane. He requested the officer to bring him back to River Falls, where he thought he would be hanged.

FOUR DAYS IN THE SNOW.

LA CROSSE, Oct. 23.—The train of cars which left here a week ago Thursday on the Southern Minnesota Division arrived here late last evening from Dell Rapids, Dakota. The train remained in the cuts west of Faldia four days and nights, and the trainmen had to walk twelve miles for food, which they hauled by team to the train. The cars show rough usage, windows being broken, doors smashed, etc., from backing into the drifts. The road is entirely clear now.

DIED ON THE TRAIN.

DETROIT, Oct. 22.—A man named Horace Johnson, with a ticket from Chicago to Boston, died on the Canada Southern train going east this morning. He left this city in apparent good health, but before reaching the crossing at Grosse Ile was discovered to be dead in his seat. The remains were sent back to this city. His age was about 70. He had in his possession \$35 and a check for \$25 payable at the Bank of Manchester, where it is supposed he lived.

TICKET TIFLE.

NEW ORLEANS, La., Oct. 22.—Edward C. Penney, doorkeeper of Comp's circus, was arrested to-day for embezzling and reselling circus tickets. About \$300 worth has been proved upon him since the circus opened here. Accused is a Vermont, and has been three years in Comp's employ, and has lately acted as commissary of the troupe.

THE GREAT ISSUES.

As Stated by Congressman Williams at Owatonna, Minnesota.

This Country Already Mexicanized—The True Spirit of the South.

The Force that Disfranchises Poor Ignorant People Disfranchises Whole States.

Democrats Don't Pretend that They Can Carry More than Four Loyal States.

The Men Who Couldn't Conquer the Union Army Command It From the Floors of Congress.

On Friday evening, October 8th, Hon. C. G. Williams, of Wisconsin, delivered the following speech at Owatonna, Minnesota, before an immense audience.

In response to the applause with which he was greeted, Mr. Williams said: "Ladies and gentlemen, I wish I could respond to you as handsomely as you have greeted me, but after six weeks of speaking I have contracted a hoarseness. A month was made to talk with and without success, in taking business to itself, it spoils the whole thing. (Laughter.) I am glad to be here with you to-night, in the home of my friend and your Representative. (Cheers.) A Representative who is a credit to your district, an honor to the State, and an aid to the body of which he is an honored member. I am following to-night, my feeble way, an engagement I made with him last winter, and I beg you to believe that I have sufficient taste and judgment not to come into Minnesota and proceed to advise its citizens as to the management of their own affairs in the Republican party. I am, therefore, only standing to-night, what I should say under any circumstances that in your representative you have a man always to be found in his place in the House. A man who is, perhaps, one of ten in the whole body, who can command the attention of the House. Who, from his position on committees, his experience in legislation, his standing in the capital, I repeat, is a credit to any people, or to any State. (Cheers.) Having said that, please consider all the rest left to you.

LET MINNESOTA MAKE NO MISTAKES.

We are struggling in Wisconsin for two additional representatives. There is an effort set on foot in Tennessee to gain some representatives, and we expect to gain a large number in Ohio. We want to wipe out the margin of Democratic majority in the House, and restore to the party and the nation that control of the House of Representatives which would not have been wrested from it except through force, fraud and violence, and I only beg of Minnesota, as I would of any State, to see that this gallant commonwealth makes no mistakes this fall. (Cheers.) There may be no person or soldier equally as brave and gallant, a statesman, a patriot, a hero and an honest man (loud applause.) Now if that be not a mere jumble of words, a mere linking together of adjectives, it makes pretty good presidential timber (cheers); and if it is a mere jumble of words, will you tell me which of these words you can take out, and then properly describe Garfield? (Cheers.)

OUR STANDARD BEARER.

We are again on the eve of a Presidential election, or we think we are. The Democracy have selected for their standard bearer a brave and gallant soldier. The Republicans have selected for their soldier equally as brave and gallant, a statesman, a patriot, a hero and an honest man (loud applause.) Now if that be not a mere jumble of words, a mere linking together of adjectives, it makes pretty good presidential timber (cheers); and if it is a mere jumble of words, will you tell me which of these words you can take out, and then properly describe Garfield? (Cheers.)

If you say take out the word "honest," I have not come here to discuss that. I have known the man for eight consecutive years. For four years I have sat with one seat of him, where I could almost put my hand on his shoulder. I have seen him in all his moods and movements. I have seen him in the simple might of his intellect, cool that tempestuous body to calm. You may go to the Republican or Democratic side—go to such man as Senator Thurman, the leading member of the North, to Jesse Black, Wm. E. Springer, or Mr. Herdricks (before this campaign,) they have all declared that James A. Garfield was an honest man and fit to be President. (Applause.)

What did the New York World, the leading Democratic paper of this country, once say? It said in substance that, the fact, that Oates Ames and General Garfield both agreed that Ames held these shares of stock for four years, with dividends accumulating very rapidly, till they reached some \$5,000. Yet Ames had paid up for money and frequently borrowing, and through members of the same Congress meeting daily, neither ever mentioned the subject to the other, should settle all doubt and controversy in Garfield's favor. And should it not, my friends? If Ames had received \$5,000 on credit, why should he not mention it to Garfield? And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of the rest of the miserable mud-slinging and slanders of this campaign. They are unworthy of notice and beneath contempt. (Applause.) And if Garfield owned the stock, why should he never inquire during four long years, and before any hint of exposure had come, "Have I not some dividends on my stock?" Or why should Ames not say: "Your dividends are accumulating remarkably. Why do you not come and draw them?" Simply because Ames understood that he did not own it. So of

my10dawtf
BIRCH, 30.5 West Milwaukee Street, Janesville,
Wisconsin, oct12dawtf

